

NOTICE TO OUR BOSTON SUBSCRIBERS.

No one of our subscribers in Boston or vicinity has ever received their papers from Mr. G. W. Light, are informed that thereafter they will receive them by mail. Should any subscriber fail to receive his paper, and will object by informing us of the fact, and also of the time to which he has paid his subscription.

WASHINGTON, D. C.

THURSDAY, APRIL 27, 1854.

SKIRMISHING.

The Washington *Sentinel* has discovered what it considers "the pivot" of the whole argument on the Nebraska Question.

If the Nebraska Bill did, as however it does not, emphatically *abolish Slavery* in *Nebraska*, and into every other Territory, would not the question, in its whole depth, length, and breadth, be its entire head and front, to fully express in the simple sentence—
A CHANGE OF RESIDENCE?

"Who will undertake to show any wrong in a change of residence of the slave?"

The status of no man's slave; no right is diminished by such a right acquire.

This change of residence does not alter the "status" of a slave, but it source its perpetuation. Without such change, the "status" of Slavery would have disappeared.

It is this "change of residence," in other words, extension of Slavery, that has increased the number of slave States from six to fifteen, subjected to his blight a large portion of the richest territory of the Union, and to its domination the Union itself: And so, were the free States of the West to repeat their prohibitions of Slavery, and allow the slaveholder to settle with his human chattels within their borders, the results, in its whole depth, length, breadth, and its entire head and front, would be fully expressed in the simple sentence—
A CHANGE OF RESIDENCE?

And what "wrong" would there be in that?

O, none at all—no right is diminished by such a right acquire.

Another "residence" was demanded by the planters, but as the Assembly proceeded no further than to petition the King to order it, the planters assembled tumultuously, and cut up the tobacco plants.

And so they staggered along, devoting them-

to the evocation of a single staple, when their soil was incapable of every variety of produce, and fostering a system of labor, the legitimate effects of which they constantly labored, although in vain, to counteract by unreasonnable legislation.

The policy of the Colony is reproduced in the States. One might imagine that the spirit of the old legislators, who fancied they could increase the wealth of a country by destroying half its crops, or regulate the natural laws of production and trade, by legislative declaration, had taken possession of the politicians who figure in these Southern Conventions.

For the last twenty-five years, these Conventions have been resolving that the slave States are superior to the free States in natural resources; that their labors ought to be diversified; that they ought to supply their own breadstuffs, do their own manufacturing, have their own shipping, carry on their own trade; but their resolves have been as fruitless as were the old colonial enactments of kindred character.

As a pretty fair illustration of the influence of Convention-declarations of opinion on the question of direct trade with Europe, take the following facts:

IMPORT.—
In 1840. In 1852.
In the Slave States, \$19,858,701 \$24,722,573
In the Free States, 78,283,218 183,573,542

Increase in twelve years:

Freed States, \$96,290,124
Slave States, 4,863,872
Difference in favor of the free States:
In 1840. \$67,423,507
In 1852. 153,850,769

EXPORTS.—
In 1840. In 1852.

From Slave States, \$7,710,283 \$97,260,295
From Free States, 54,565,863 113,363,713

Increase in twelve years:

From Free States, \$58,786,850
From Slave States, 19,783,973
Difference in favor of the free States:
In 1840. \$22,831,420
In 1852. 16,005,447

So much for the direct trade on which these Slaveholders have resorted; as a bold argument by repetition produces an impression which the single presentation of a good one fails to accomplish.

The Nebraska-Kansas Bill, which has passed the Senate, occupies five and a half solid columns of small type in the *Globe*. The pro-slavery press, aware that the People generally have not examined it in its details, know that it can proclaim, and sophistically and misrepresent with comparative impunity. So soon as we can command the room, we shall print the Bill, so that all our readers at least, may see for themselves how utterly its provisions disregard what the Union vaguely enough styles Popular Sovereignty. Meantime, let us again examine this "humbug."

On the other hand, Bill to repeal it is

sustained, not by any demonstrations of Popular Sovereignty, but simply by the pride and self-interest of a small class of slaveholders, who have no respect for the rights or interests of the People, when opposed to their policy.

No, Pro-Slavery men, no primary meeting of the People, no primary meeting of the North, South, East or West, had intimated any dissatisfaction with the Act of 1820, or a desire for its repeal; so that the Bill is nothing but an attempt of a would-be-Sovereign Class, to annul a great measure, enacted by the real Sovereign People, sustained by them for the third of a century, and still resting on the sanctions of the world.

The Act bears the stamp of Popular Sovereignty; the Bill to repeal it, bears the stamp of a Class Interest, which, once no more for the political rights of the Free People of the United States, than it does for the natural rights of the three millions of slaves, on whose unpaid labor it has grown fat and arrogant.

If an instance can be shown in which a manumitted negro in Virginia, under no such pressure, has voluntarily sought to return to bondage, that fact in itself shows what fearful havoc the system has made of a nature created in the image of God,—where is the free working man of the North, so degraded, vile, poor, miserable, let him be without friends and without hope in the world, who would not spurn the idea of becoming the slave of the rich man, although with the certain prospect of having all his animal wants supplied, and such protection vouchsafed to him, as we extend to horses and cattle?

Again: Congress in this Bill ordains, that the Executive power shall vest in a Governor; that there shall be a Secretary; that the Legislative power shall be lodged in the Governor and Legislative Assembly, the latter to consist of a Council and a House of Representatives; that the judicial power shall be vested in a supreme court, district courts, probate courts, and justices of the peace; and that there shall be an attorney and a marshal. This organization of the Government is prescribed, without any reference to the wishes or views of the "Sovereign People." Possibly they might prefer government by a Territorial Council, or that there might be but one legislative chamber, or that the judicial power might be established under other forms; but this Bill of Popular Sovereignty does not allow the Sovereign People to have any voice or weight in the matter. They must take with our Slaveholders, the form of the government of the Commonwealth.

Again: The "Sovereign People" have no voice in determining how these departments of their government shall be constituted, what shall be their powers, under what limitations they shall be exercised, how long the persons exercising governmental functions shall continue in office, in what way and how much they shall be paid—in all of which who does not recognize the "simple and sublime" acknowledgment of the sovereign right of the People of a Territory to govern themselves.

Again: The Governor, the Secretary, the Chief Justice, Associate Justice, the Attorney, and the Marshal, shall be elected by the People—O, no—that is a mistake; we were under the momentary delusion which has turned the head of our neighbor of the *Union* about Popular Sovereignty—"shall be nominated, and by and with the advice and consent of the Senate, appointed, by the President of the United States!" Was ever "Sovereign People" so treated before? What! their Governor, a part of the law-making power, with authority to veto all acts of their Assembly, unless passed by a majority of two-thirds in each branch, and whose business it is to see that the laws under which they live be enforced, totally independent of them, deriving its existence not from them, but from the Government of the United States? We must be told, not to their shame, that the Government of the United States, in its capacity as a committee to prepare a charter, and to procure its passage by Virginia and other Southern States.

All these attempts failed. In 1850, it is recorded, the tobacco culture still attracted the greater portion of capital and labor, and the result was, the dependence of the colonists upon others for their supplies of necessaries. Cloth was manufactured successfully in New England, but nothing of the kind was attempted in the Colonies; and the maritime portion of the former was already recognized, while, notwithstanding the efforts of the Assembly of Virginia to encourage ship-building and navigation, only one or two small vessels were owned in that colony.

In 1852, the Assembly passed various acts, to compel a diversification of industry—such as the planting of mulberry trees, offering premiums for silk, ships built, for woolen and linen cloth, home-made. Two acres of corn, or one of wheat, was to be cultivated in every suitable place, and a ten-house, with curtains and shockers attached, was to be established at the public expense in each county, hiding Song Recluse at a fixed price, to be sold for the use of shoes, and sold at rates prescribed in the statute.

The next effort was, to force the growth of cotton. An act was passed, for converting the hamlet of Jackson into a town of thirty-two briar houses, each of the counties being required to build one house, for which labor might be imposed, at certain rates. To encourage the building of the others, each individual who built a house was to receive from the public ten thousand pounds of tobacco, and all persons settling in the town were to be exempted from arrest for two years. This scheme was extended so as to embrace projects of other towns.

ROTAT CAMERINE, MASS.—We regret to learn that a serious riot has again occurred between the students of the college and the firemen. In the collision, the firemen have come off victorious; but several on both sides were severely injured.

* See *Hilliard's Colonial History* for many such examples.

law, which would secure them the carrying trade of the whole country. The other States were willing to confer the power, but determined to prohibit its exercise except by a majority of two thirds of both branches of the Legislature. Their peculiar interests in this respect, and the peculiar interests of the two extreme Southern States in connection with the slave trade, furnished materials for a Compromise, and accordingly, by an arrangement between them, it was provided that a navigation law might be passed by a simple majority, and that the power of Congress over the slave trade should not be exercised till the year 1808.

This Compromise was adopted against the votes of Virginia and Maryland, and it was the result of a bargain securing certain sectional interests, and not of a conviction of its necessity.

If the Nebraska Bill did, as however it does not, emphatically legislate Slavery in *Nebraska*, and into every other Territory, would not the question, in its whole depth, length, and breadth, be its entire head and front, to fully express in the simple sentence—
A CHANGE OF RESIDENCE?

"Who will undertake to show any wrong in a change of residence of the slave?"

The status of no man's slave; no right is diminished by such a right acquire.

This change of residence does not alter the "status" of a slave, but it source its perpetuation. Without such change, the "status" of Slavery would have disappeared.

It is this "change of residence," in other words, extension of Slavery, that has increased the number of slave States from six to fifteen, subjected to his blight a large portion of the richest territory of the Union, and to its domination the Union itself: And so, were the free States of the West to repeat their prohibitions of Slavery, and allow the slaveholder to settle with his human chattels within their borders, the results, in its whole depth, length, breadth, and its entire head and front, would be fully expressed in the simple sentence—
A CHANGE OF RESIDENCE?

And what "wrong" would there be in that?

O, none at all—no right is diminished by such a right acquire.

Another "residence" was demanded by the planters, but as the Assembly proceeded no further than to petition the King to order it, the planters assembled tumultuously, and cut up the tobacco plants.

And so they staggered along, devoting them-

to the evocation of a single staple, when their soil was incapable of every variety of produce, and fostering a system of labor, the legitimate effects of which they constantly labored, although in vain, to counteract by unreasonnable legislation.

The policy of the Colony is reproduced in the States. One might imagine that the spirit of the old legislators, who fancied they could increase the wealth of a country by destroying half its crops, or regulate the natural laws of production and trade, by legislative declaration, had taken possession of the politicians who figure in these Southern Conventions.

For the last twenty-five years, these Conventions have been resolving that the slave States are superior to the free States in natural resources; that their labors ought to be diversified; that they ought to supply their own breadstuffs, do their own manufacturing, have their own shipping, carry on their own trade; but their resolves have been as fruitless as were the old colonial enactments of kindred character.

As a pretty fair illustration of the influence of Convention-declarations of opinion on the question of direct trade with Europe, take the following facts:

IMPORT.—
In 1840. In 1852.
In the Slave States, \$19,858,701 \$24,722,573
In the Free States, 78,283,218 183,573,542

Increase in twelve years:

Freed States, \$96,290,124
Slave States, 4,863,872
Difference in favor of the free States:
In 1840. \$67,423,507
In 1852. 153,850,769

EXPORTS.—
In 1840. In 1852.

From Slave States, \$7,710,283 \$97,260,295
From Free States, 54,565,863 113,363,713

Increase in twelve years:

From Free States, \$58,786,850
From Slave States, 19,783,973
Difference in favor of the free States:
In 1840. \$22,831,420
In 1852. 16,005,447

So much for the direct trade on which these Slaveholders have resorted; as a bold argument by repetition produces an impression which the single presentation of a good one fails to accomplish.

The Nebraska-Kansas Bill, which has passed the Senate, occupies five and a half solid columns of small type in the *Globe*. The pro-slavery press, aware that the People generally have not examined it in its details, know that it can proclaim, and sophistically and misrepresent with comparative impunity. So soon as we can command the room, we shall print the Bill, so that all our readers at least, may see for themselves how utterly its provisions disregard what the Union vaguely enough styles Popular Sovereignty. Meantime, let us again examine this "humbug."

If an instance can be shown in which a manumitted negro in Virginia, under no such pressure, has voluntarily sought to return to bondage, that fact in itself shows what fearful

havoc the system has made of a nature created in the image of God;—where is the free working man of the North, so degraded, vile, poor, miserable, let him be without friends and without hope in the world, who would not spurn the idea of becoming the slave of the rich man, although with the certain prospect of having all his animal wants supplied, and such protection vouchsafed to him, as we extend to horses and cattle?

In 1852, the price of tobacco was imposed in a sumptuary law, by which the friends of the *Nebraska* Bill go to the country, and on that they challenge their opponents to the conflict. The principle of Popular Sovereignty is the gist of the measure, and upon it we shall not cease to rally the Democratic hosts, until Abolition and all its allies shall be overwhelmed. It is this grand principle on which President Pierce has planted himself, and on which he will stand unmoved until it shall triumph. On this principle the issue will be finally made up, and then the result will easily be inferred to the former.

This is the argument urged in "the organ" from day to day; it is the sum and substance of all its labored articles of support of the Bill. Met it as fairly and squarely as you may, expose its falsity and absurdity, prove by the language and provisions of the Bill itself that on beginning to end, it practically denies to the People of a Territory the rights of sovereignty, and surrounds them with "Congressional limitations and restrictions"; still, with a vast and varied and far-reaching character.

The policy of the Colony is reproduced in the States. One might imagine that the spirit of the old legislators, who fancied they could increase the wealth of a country by destroying half its crops, or regulate the natural laws of production and trade, by legislative declaration, had taken possession of the politicians who figure in these Southern Conventions.

For the last twenty-five years, these Conventions have been resolving that the slave States are superior to the free States in natural resources; that their labors ought to be diversified; that they ought to supply their own breadstuffs, do their own manufacturing, have their own shipping, carry on their own trade; but their resolves have been as fruitless as were the old colonial enactments of kindred character.

As a pretty fair illustration of the influence of Convention-declarations of opinion on the question of direct trade with Europe, take the following facts:

IMPORT.—
In 1840. In 1852.
In the Slave States, \$19,858,701 \$24,722,573
In the Free States, 78,283,218 183,573,542

Increase in twelve years:

Freed States, \$96,290,124
Slave States, 4,863,872
Difference in favor of the free States:
In 1840. \$67,423,507
In 1852. 153,850,769

EXPORTS.—
In 1840. In 1852.

From Slave States, \$7,710,283 \$97,260,295
From Free States, 54,565,863 113,363,713

Increase in twelve years:

From Free States, \$58,786,850
From Slave States, 19,783,973
Difference in favor of the free States:
In 1840. \$22,831,420
In 1852. 16,005,447

So much for the direct trade on which these Slaveholders have resorted; as a bold argument by repetition produces an impression which the single presentation of a good one fails to accomplish.

The Nebraska-Kansas Bill, which has passed the Senate, occupies five and a half solid columns of small type in the *Globe*. The pro-slavery press, aware that the People generally have not examined it in its details, know that it can proclaim, and sophistically and misrepresent with comparative impunity. So soon as we can command the room, we shall print the Bill, so that all our readers at least, may see for themselves how utterly its provisions disregard what the Union vaguely enough styles Popular Sovereignty. Meantime, let us again examine this "humbug."

If an instance can be shown in which a manumitted negro in Virginia, under no such pressure, has voluntarily sought to return to bondage, that fact in itself shows what fearful

POPULAR SOVEREIGNTY AGAIN.

The Pro-Slavery press persists in a attempt to impose upon the People by clap-trap phrases. The opponents of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, they say, are constantly raising false issues. The issue presented by the Nebraska Bill is the simple and sublime question whether the People are to enjoy the rights of self-government in their Territories, or whether the Government is to control them.

They produce statistics to show that Principle has accomplished and is accomplishing far more for the religious culture of the masses, than the union of Church and State in Great Britain. Nobody supposes that therefore they are prejudiced against their own country, or unfriendly to it. So, the friends of the Democratic Principle in England, are in the habit of contrasting that country with the United States, for the purpose of demonstrating the elevating and invigorating influences of Democracy, the degrading and depressing influences of Aristocracy, upon the masses; the thrift and progress fostered by the former, and waste and debility engendered by the latter; but who suspects them therefore of hating their own country? The struggle is between systems, and those must be tried not only by their intrinsic nature, but by their workings and results.

PRO-SLAVERY SLAVERY TO FREEDOM.

The Richmond (Va.) papers specify three or four instances in that State in which certain manumitted slaves petitioned the Legislature for permission to take masters; and then adds, that the Anti-Slavery men of the North are as ignorant as the people of the South.

In instituting the act of 1820, and respecting the statement to repeat it, we stand upon the true doctrine of Popular Sovereignty.

It is that the argument urged in "the organ" from day to day; it is the sum and substance of all its labored articles of support of the Bill.

And so they staggered along, devoting them-

to the evocation of a single staple, when their soil was incapable of every variety of produce, and fostering a system of labor, the legitimate effects of which they constantly labored, although in vain, to counteract by unreasonnable legislation.

The policy of the Colony is reproduced in the States. One might imagine that the spirit of the old legislators, who fancied they could increase the wealth of a country by destroying half its crops, or regulate the natural laws of production and trade, by legislative declaration, had taken possession of the politicians who figure in these Southern Conventions.

For the last twenty-five years, these Conventions have been resolving that the slave States are superior to the free States in natural resources; that their labors ought to be diversified; that they ought to supply their own breadstuffs, do their own manufacturing, have their own shipping, carry on their own trade; but their resolves have been as fruitless as were the old colonial enactments of kindred character.

As a pretty fair illustration of the influence of Convention-declarations of opinion on the question of direct trade with Europe, take the following facts:

IMPORT.—
In 1840. In 1852.
In the Slave States, \$19,858,701 \$24,722,573
In the Free States, 78,283,218 183,573,542

Increase in twelve years:

Freed States, \$96,290,124
Slave States, 4,863,872
Difference in favor of the free States:
In 1840. \$67,423,507
In 1852. 153,850,769

EXPORTS.—
In 1840. In 1852.

From Slave States, \$7,710,283 \$97,260,295
From Free States, 54,565,863 113,363,713

Increase in twelve years:

From Free States, \$58,786,850
From Slave States, 19,783,973
Difference in favor of the free States:
In 1840. \$22,831,420
In 1852. 16,005,447

So much for the direct trade on which these Slaveholders have resorted; as a bold argument by repetition produces an impression which the single presentation of a good one fails to accomplish.

The Nebraska-Kansas Bill, which has passed the Senate, occupies five and a half solid columns of small type in the *Globe*. The pro-slavery press, aware that the People generally have not examined it in its details, know that it can proclaim, and sophistically and misrepresent with comparative impunity. So soon as we can command the room, we shall print the Bill, so that all our readers at least, may see for themselves how utterly its provisions disregard what the Union vaguely enough styles Popular Sovereignty. Meantime, let us again examine this "humbug."

If an instance can be shown in which a manumitted negro in Virginia, under no such pressure, has voluntarily sought to return to bondage, that fact in itself shows what fearful

havoc the system has made of a nature created in the image of God;—where is the free working man of the North, so degraded, vile, poor, miserable, let him be without friends and without hope in the world, who would not spurn the idea of becoming the slave of the rich man, although with the certain prospect of having all his animal wants supplied, and such protection vouchsafed to him, as we extend to horses and cattle?

It is understood that the conspirators of the *Nebraska* Bill, of Pennsylvania; Calumet, Tennessee; Fenton, of New York; Franklin, of Maryland; Hunt, of Louisiana; Macie, of Indiana; Cut-Off, of New Jersey; and others, of New York, Michigan, Ohio, Indiana, Illinois, Wisconsin, and Iowa, have been working so hard for the repeal of the Missouri Compromise, have matured a plan for effecting their object next Monday. A new Bill embracing this object is to be sprung upon the House, the member to whom care is intrusted, is recognized by the Speaker; on motion, a majority dispenses with the usual order of proceedings; the Bill is read twice, and under the operation of the previous question, is voted through, or defeated, examination, or time for amendment.

From 1847, we have been an attentive observer of the Congressional debates on Slavery. They have taken a wide range and had taxed the highest energies of our public men of all sections. The questions discussed have been: First, Slavery, in its relations to Natural Law, the Law of Nations, the Constitution of the United States, the State Government, and the Action of the Federal Government, and the intentions of the *Missouri Comp*

nations, so that they may learn what are the necessary qualifications of an office-holder? They are already aware that capacity and honesty are rather minor considerations than even the power to be popular at all.

What is it to us that the government or the majority of the Senate in its discretion?

If there is a class interest that reigns supreme in that body, and fidelity to its demands is an absolute condition to the ratification of any nomination, surely the Senate is too bold and honorable to shrink from avowing the fact. We submit that it is very cruel, especially to officers serving, to keep this matter hidden from the people. To make public the test might have a softening influence on the Anti-Slavery prejudices of our fellow-citizens, and especially dispossess the office-seekers to repant, in sackcloth and ashes, of Free-Southern, and to bring forth fruits meet for repentance. Besides, the Senate might acquire a new hold on the affections of the People. Making the support of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise a test of fitness for office, would vindicate its solid consistency in the eyes of mankind. It would show the same kind of pluck and sagacity the President did, when, through Mr. Cushing, he put his head on Free Soil, break up the *estate cordiale* between the Hunker Democracy and the Independent Democracy in Massachusetts, defeated the new Constitution, and gave the State to the Whigs. That illustrious act of devotion to Slavery, regardless of consequences, we commend to the Senate. Let it emulate the bravery of the great man, and a few publicly the test will now enforce *secretly* submission to Slavery in general, and support of the repeal of the Missouri Compromise in particular, absolute conditions to the ratification by this body of all nominations.

THE HOMESTEAD BILL.

We observe that many people are under the impression that the Homestead Bill will pass the Senate. It is ungracious to disturb this pleasing illusion, but there is no use in deceiving ourselves. The Senators from the Slave States, with one or two exceptions, will vote against it, and it is too much to expect such wise and conservative gentlemen, as Mr. Tocquey, and the Senators from the State of Camden and Amboy, as the New Yorkers phrase it, to countenance so radical and progressive a measure.

We confide we have little hope of the Public Lands. They are doomed, unless the People choose to send representatives to Congress who will protest them against plundering, robbing, and combining.

A homestead bill, if it could be passed, would secure to the poor and landless something from the wrecks which these combinations are making of the public patrimony; but the Senate is in the way, and, for right or wrong, to the contrary, will always be in the way. It is not a popular body in its composition, or in its sympathies. It will always derive its existence from the People, and its responsibility to the People is too remote and feeble to ensure for them a great weight in its deliberations. A body that can pass the Nebraska Bill, ratify the Gadsden Treaty, and reject the Homestead Bill, needs reconstruction.

THE BALTIMORE PLATFORM AND THE BILL FOR THE RELIEF OF THE INDIGENT IN SANKE.

The Baltimore Platform is constantly held up as embracing the whole creed of Democracy, and belief or acquiescence in it is demanded as a condition to fellowship in the so-called Democratic Party. General Pierce placed himself upon it when he accepted the nomination for the Presidency, reaffirmed his adhesion to it in his Inauguration, and announced the confirmation of it. It will be fully tested by the trial of the Administration. Since then, his party through State Conventions and through his united press has invested this platform with a certain kind of sanctity, pretending to regard it with almost as much reverence as the ancient Jews cherished for the Decalogue.

But it was easy to see that the great object of all this devotion was to screen the system of Slavery from dismemberment. The ten commands of the Baltimore Platform resolved themselves into this—that should not question the claims, limit the power, restrict the Slave Interest. All other sins may be forgiven; but resistance to Slavery shall not be forgiven. You may go for protection to the iron interests of Pennsylvania, for improvement of rivers and harbors, for using the money of the Public Treasury to enrich private corporations for wasting the public lands in grants to railroad speculators, and yet be a good Democrat. All these things are forbidden by the Baltimore Platform, but they are subordinate. The one thing needful is obedience to the article on Slavery. When adhesion to the Baltimore Platform is demanded as a condition to party fellowship or political preference, it simply means acquiescence in whatever claim the Slave Power may set up.

We do not care whether the politicians in Washington know that our representation is the exact truth.

Let us see how strictly the Baltimore Platform has been adhered to by the so-called Democratic Senate and House, in the history of the Bill reported last week for the relief of the indigent Insane. This Bill provides for the sum of ten million dollars for the public lands, to be apportioned in the compound ratio of their geographical area and representation in the House of Representatives, and to be used by them exclusively for the benefit of the indigent insane within their respective limits, as provided in the act. The second section contains the following provision:

"That the land aforesaid, after being surveyed, shall be apportioned to the several States and Territories in sections or subdivisions of sections, and when sold, or otherwise disposed of, the price of each section or subdivision of sections, or territory, one dollar and twenty-five cents per acre—the value of said lands to be determined by the Governor of said State or Territory—the quantity to which said State or Territory shall entitle, to be determined by the number of inhabitants and the Secretary of the Interior in whose behalf the Surveyor of the Interior is to be appointed."

And, it might add, if they fall victim to their fidelity, we must help them. That they must blanch the franchises of their own country, and deprive it of the right to self-government, to sustain their rights.

Now, we do not expect as to encounter ourselves with them, after they have been disabled. We need while men, not cripples—men that can do us service, and the same time take care of themselves. Webster and Ellsworth were very good men in their way, willing to oblige us, but unfortunately without the faculty of taking care of themselves. So with Dickinson and Case—excellent gentlemen, though they are in their generation, but unfortunately.

The new candidates for our favor, now so prominent on the political stage, may, it is to be feared, meet a similar fate; but how can we help it? We are not responsible for Northern fanaticism, nor can it be expected that the South shall build an asylum large enough to accommodate all its victims. Besides, the friends of the Constitution and our rights must learn to take care of themselves, while discharging their duties to us under the Constitution. The more fast, in their zeal to serve us, they have been so blundering as to forfeit their political position at home, shows that, however willing, they are kin to fraud, but wise, and as they can give us kind words, but not filial support, but competence, and riches to the

treasury of the nation.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform, which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

construction of roads, canals, and other works

of internal improvement."

What does the Baltimore Platform, as they call it, voted indiscriminately? There was little opposition in the Senate; and in the House, where Mr. Bissell, a Baltimore Platform man, had the charge of it, it was summarily put through by a vote of 81 to 53, no Party being arrayed in opposition to it, but members without distinction of Party, supporting it.

Now, what says the Baltimore Platform,

which this Democratic Congress has been at such pains to concoct?

"V. Resolved, That the proceeds of the public lands are to be smelting applied to the

